

REMARKS

The Office Action dated August 2, 2004 has been carefully reviewed and the following response has been made in consequence thereof.

Claims 1-20 are now pending in this application. Claims 1-20 stand rejected.

The rejection of Claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fisher et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,005,314) ("Fisher") in view of Admitted Prior Art ("APA") of Figure 1 in view of Story et al. (U.S. Patent No. 3,787,014) ("Story") and in further view of Boede et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,933,809) ("Boede") is respectfully traversed.

Fisher describes a motor (50) that includes a housing (54) formed by a motor shell (56) and a pair of endshields (58 and 60). A stator (72) is mounted within the motor shell. The motor also includes a base (92) for support and mounting. Notably, Fisher does not describe nor suggest a motor that includes a housing body extending between an inner surface and an outer surface, wherein the body includes a plurality of raised projections that each have a thickness that is approximately equal to a thickness of the housing body. Additionally, Fisher does not describe nor suggest that the head of the fasteners is potentially exposed to a rotating component such as a motor.

APA describes a motor housing (10) that includes a shell (12) having an inner surface (14) and an outer surface (16). A plurality of mounting hardware or fasteners (20) are attached to the shell outer surface and extend radially outwardly from the shell outer surface. Fasteners (20) are spaced circumferentially around the housing and may be welded to shell outer surface (16). Notably, APA does not describe nor suggest a motor that includes a housing body extending between an inner surface and an outer surface, wherein the body includes a plurality of raised projections that each have a thickness that is approximately equal to a thickness of the housing body. Additionally, APA does not describe nor suggest that the head of the fasteners is potentially exposed to a rotating component such as a motor.

Story describes a replacement motor mounting (50) that includes an adapter bracket (58) that includes a circular central portion and four arms. A set of fastener receiving holes (62, 64) is formed in the arms and is configured to receive a plurality of fasteners (66) extending axially from an endshield. Notably, Story does not describe nor suggest a motor that includes a housing body extending between an inner surface and an outer surface, wherein the body includes a plurality of raised projections that each have a thickness that is approximately equal to a thickness of the housing body. Additionally, Story does not describe nor suggest that the head of the fasteners is potentially exposed to a rotating component such as a motor.

Boede describes a modular assembly of diverse electrical components housed in a box (10). The box is closed with a cover (47) that includes a plurality of mounting holes (56) positioned in recesses (58) and configured to receive a plurality of mounting screws (52). Notably, Boede does not describe nor suggest a motor that includes a housing body extending between an inner surface and an outer surface, wherein the body includes a plurality of raised projections that each have a thickness that is approximately equal to a thickness of the housing body. Rather, Boede describes a box that includes a cover having a plurality of recesses that have a thickness greater than the cover thickness. (Figure 5).

Claim 1 recites “a method for mounting a motor to a support, said method comprising providing a mounting system, the mounting system including a plurality of fasteners, the motor including a pair of endshields and a housing extending therebetween, the housing including a plurality of recessed openings, an outer surface, an inner surface, a housing body extending between the inner surface and the outer surface, and a plurality of raised projections, wherein each of the projections has a thickness that is equal to approximately a thickness of the housing body.”

None of Fisher, APA, Story, or Boede, considered alone or in combination, describe or suggest a method for mounting a motor to a support, the method includes providing a mounting system, the mounting system including a plurality of fasteners, the motor including a pair of endshields and a housing extending therebetween, the housing including a plurality of recessed openings, an outer surface, an inner surface, a housing body extending between

the inner surface and the outer surface, and a plurality of raised projections, wherein each of the projections has a thickness that is equal to approximately a thickness of the housing body. Rather, Fisher describes a motor that includes a housing formed by a motor shell and a pair of endshields. APA describes a motor housing that includes a shell having an inner surface and an outer surface, and a plurality of fasteners attached to the shell outer surface that extend radially outwardly from the shell outer surface. Story describes a replacement motor mounting that includes a set of fastener receiving holes that are configured to receive a plurality of fasteners that extend axially from an endshield. Boede describes a box that includes a cover having a plurality of recesses that have a thickness greater than the cover thickness. For at least the reasons set forth above, Claim 1 is submitted to be patentable over Fisher in view of APA, Story, and Boede.

Claims 2-4 depend from independent Claim 1. When the recitations of Claims 2-4 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 1, Applicants submit that dependent Claims 2-4 likewise are patentable over Fisher in view of APA, Story, and Boede.

Claim 5 recites “a housing for a motor extending between a pair of endshields, said housing comprising...an inner surface...an outer surface...a housing body extending between said inner surface and said outer surface, said body comprising a thickness...at least one raised projection extending outwardly from at least one of said housing inner surface and said housing outer surface defining a recess with respect to said housing inner surface, said projection comprising at least one opening extending therethrough, said at least one raised projection comprising a thickness approximately equal to said housing body thickness....”

None of Fisher, APA, Story, or Boede, considered alone or in combination, describe or suggest a housing for a motor extending between a pair of endshields, the housing including an inner surface, an outer surface, a housing body extending between the inner surface and the outer surface, the body including a thickness, at least one raised projection extending outwardly from at least one of the housing inner surface and the housing outer surface defining a recess with respect to the housing inner surface, the projection including at least one opening extending therethrough, the at least one raised projection including a thickness approximately equal to the housing body thickness. Rather, Fisher describes a

motor that includes a housing formed by a motor shell and a pair of endshields. APA describes a motor housing that includes a shell having an inner surface and an outer surface, and a plurality of fasteners attached to the shell outer surface that extend radially outwardly from the shell outer surface. Story describes a replacement motor mounting that includes a set of fastener receiving holes that are configured to receive a plurality of fasteners that extend axially from an endshield. Boede describes a box that includes a cover having a plurality of recesses that have a thickness greater than the cover thickness. For at least the reasons set forth above, Claim 5 is submitted to be patentable over Fisher in view of APA, Story, and Boede.

Claims 6-13 depend from independent Claim 5. When the recitations of Claims 6-13 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 5, Applicants submit that dependent Claims 6-13 likewise are patentable over Fisher in view of APA, Story, and Boede.

Claim 14 recites “a motor comprising a pair of endshields...a housing extending between said endshields including at least one raised projection extending outwardly from said housing, said housing comprising an outer surface and an opposite inner surface, and a body extending therebetween, said body comprising a thickness, said projection defining a recess with respect to said inner surface and comprising a thickness approximately equal to said housing body thickness....”

None of Fisher, APA, Story, or Boede, considered alone or in combination, describe or suggest a motor including a pair of endshields, a housing extending between the endshields including at least one raised projection extending outwardly from the housing, the housing including an outer surface and an opposite inner surface, and a body extending therebetween, the body including a thickness, the projection defining a recess with respect to the inner surface and including a thickness approximately equal to the housing body thickness. Rather, Fisher describes a motor that includes a housing formed by a motor shell and a pair of endshields. APA describes a motor housing that includes a shell having an inner surface and an outer surface, and a plurality of fasteners attached to the shell outer surface that extend radially outwardly from the shell outer surface. Story describes a replacement motor

mounting that includes a set of fastener receiving holes that are configured to receive a plurality of fasteners that extend axially from an endshield. Boede describes a box that includes a cover having a plurality of recesses that have a thickness greater than the cover thickness. For at least the reasons set forth above, Claim 14 is submitted to be patentable over Fisher in view of APA, Story and Boede.

Claims 15-20 depend, directly or indirectly, from independent Claim 14. When the recitations of Claims 15-20 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 14, Applicants submit that dependent Claims 15-20 likewise are patentable over Fisher in view of APA, Story and Boede.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that a prima facie case of obviousness has not been established. As explained by the Federal Circuit, "to establish obviousness based on a combination of the elements disclosed in the prior art, there must be some motivation, suggestion or teaching of the desirability of making the specific combination that was made by the applicant." In re Kotzab, 54 USPQ2d 1308, 1316 (Fed. Cir. 2000). MPEP 2143.01.

Moreover, the Federal Circuit has determined that:

[I]t is impermissible to use the claimed invention as an instruction manual or "template" to piece together the teachings of the prior art so that the claimed invention is rendered obvious. This court has previously stated that "[o]ne cannot use hindsight reconstruction to pick and choose among isolated disclosures in the prior art to deprecate the claimed invention."

In re Fitch, 23 USPQ2d 1780, 1784 (Fed. Cir. 1992). Further, under Section 103, "it is impermissible . . . to pick and choose from any one reference only so much of it as will support a given position, to the exclusion of other parts necessary to the full appreciation of what such reference fairly suggests to one of ordinary skill in the art." In re Wesslau, 147 USPQ 391, 393 (CCPA 1965). Rather, there must be some suggestion, outside of Applicants' disclosure, in the prior art to combine such inferences, and a reasonable expectation of success must be both found in the prior art, and not based on Applicants' disclosure. In re Vaeck, 20 USPQ2d 1436 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

In the present case, neither a suggestion nor motivation to modify the cited art, nor any reasonable expectation of success has been shown. Specifically, no teaching, or suggestion has been shown to modify Fisher with APA, Story, Boede to include fasteners that extend through a housing including a plurality of projections having a thickness equal to the housing thickness. Rather, the Section 103 rejection appears to be based on a hindsight reconstruction in which several disclosures have been picked and chosen in an attempt to deprecate the present invention. Of course, such a combination is impermissible, and for this reason alone, Applicants request that the Section 103 rejection of Claims 1-20 be withdrawn.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that Boede teaches away from the present invention. If art "teaches away" from a claimed invention, such a teaching supports the nonobviousness of the invention. U.S. v. Adams, 148 USPQ 479 (1966); Gillette Co. v. S.C. Johnson & Son, Inc., 16 USPQ2d 1923, 1927 (Fed. Cir. 1990). In light of this standard, it is respectfully submitted that the cited art, as a whole, is not suggestive of the presently claimed invention. Specifically, Boede describes a box that includes a cover having a plurality of recesses that have a thickness greater than the cover thickness (Figure 5). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Boede teaches away from the present invention.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 103 of Claims 1-20 be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 5-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Admitted Prior Art ("APA") of Figure 1 in view of Story and in further view of Boede is respectfully traversed.

APA, Story, and Boede are described above.

Claim 5 recites "a housing for a motor extending between a pair of endshields, said housing comprising...an inner surface...an outer surface...a housing body extending between said inner surface and said outer surface, said body comprising a thickness...at least one raised projection extending outwardly from at least one of said housing inner surface and said

housing outer surface defining a recess with respect to said housing inner surface, said projection comprising at least one opening extending therethrough, said at least one raised projection comprising a thickness approximately equal to said housing body thickness....”

None of APA, Story, or Boede, considered alone or in combination, describe or suggest a housing for a motor extending between a pair of endshields, the housing including an inner surface, an outer surface, a housing body extending between the inner surface and the outer surface, the body including a thickness, at least one raised projection extending outwardly from at least one of the housing inner surface and the housing outer surface defining a recess with respect to the housing inner surface, the projection including at least one opening extending therethrough, the at least one raised projection including a thickness approximately equal to the housing body thickness. Rather, APA describes a motor housing that includes a shell having an inner surface and an outer surface, and a plurality of fasteners attached to the shell outer surface that extend radially outwardly from the shell outer surface. Story describes a replacement motor mounting that includes a set of fastener receiving holes that are configured to receive a plurality of fasteners that extend axially from an endshield. Boede describes a box that includes a cover having a plurality of recesses that have a thickness greater than the cover thickness. For at least the reasons set forth above, Claim 5 is submitted to be patentable over APA in view of Story and Boede.

Claims 6-13 depend from independent Claim 5. When the recitations of Claims 6-13 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 5, Applicants submit that dependent Claims 6-13 likewise are patentable over APA in view of Story and Boede.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that a prima facie case of obviousness has not been established. As explained by the Federal Circuit, "to establish obviousness based on a combination of the elements disclosed in the prior art, there must be some motivation, suggestion or teaching of the desirability of making the specific combination that was made by the applicant." In re Kotzab, 54 USPQ2d 1308, 1316 (Fed. Cir. 2000). MPEP 2143.01.

Moreover, the Federal Circuit has determined that:

[I]t is impermissible to use the claimed invention as an instruction manual or "template" to piece together the teachings of the prior art so that the claimed invention is rendered obvious. This court has previously stated that "[o]ne cannot use hindsight reconstruction to pick and choose among isolated disclosures in the prior art to deprecate the claimed invention."

In re Fitch, 23 USPQ2d 1780, 1784 (Fed. Cir. 1992). Further, under Section 103, "it is impermissible . . . to pick and choose from any one reference only so much of it as will support a given position, to the exclusion of other parts necessary to the full appreciation of what such reference fairly suggests to one of ordinary skill in the art." In re Wesslau, 147 USPQ 391, 393 (CCPA 1965). Rather, there must be some suggestion, outside of Applicants' disclosure, in the prior art to combine such inferences, and a reasonable expectation of success must be both found in the prior art, and not based on Applicants' disclosure. In re Vaeck, 20 USPQ2d 1436 (Fed. Cir. 1991).


In the present case, neither a suggestion nor motivation to modify the cited art, nor any reasonable expectation of success has been shown. Specifically, no teaching, or suggestion has been shown to modify APA with Story and Boede to include fasteners that extend through a housing including a plurality of projections having a thickness equal to the housing thickness. Rather, the Section 103 rejection appears to be based on a hindsight reconstruction in which several disclosures have been picked and chosen in an attempt to deprecate the present invention. Of course, such a combination is impermissible, and for this reason alone, Applicants request that the Section 103 rejection of Claims 5-13 be withdrawn.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that Boede teaches away from the present invention. If art "teaches away" from a claimed invention, such a teaching supports the nonobviousness of the invention. U.S. v. Adams, 148 USPQ 479 (1966); Gillette Co. v. S.C. Johnson & Son, Inc., 16 USPQ2d 1923, 1927 (Fed. Cir. 1990). In light of this standard, it is respectfully submitted that the cited art, as a whole, is not suggestive of the presently claimed invention. Specifically, Boede describes a box that includes a cover having a plurality of recesses that have a thickness greater than the cover thickness. (Figure 5). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Boede teaches away from the present invention.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 103 of Claims 5-13 be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all the claims now active in this application are believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Robert B. Reeser, III', is written over a horizontal line.

Robert B. Reeser, III
Registration No. 45,548
ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP
One Metropolitan Square, Suite 2600
St. Louis, Missouri 63102-2740
(314) 621-5070